FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-115-S
Friday
16 June 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-115-S *16 June 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Congress Proceedings Continue 29 May 1
Fifth Session, Continued *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 1

Congress Proceedings Continue 29 May

Fifth Session, Continued

18001163 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 June 89 Morning Edition pp 1-4

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record"—IZVESTIYA headline; the stenographic record for the morning and afternoon sessions on 29 May were published in the 15 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT Supplement]

[Text]

Fifth Session

29 May 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1600.

Session chaired by M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

M.S. Gorbachev: Respected comrade deputies! The evening session of our congress is now open. We have arranged to devote the evening session to procedural matters that have accumulated up to this time. First I would like to give the floor to presidium member Comrade Gorbunov, who will set forth certain matters relating to this subject, and then we shall move on to the speeches of the comrades who have been scheduled to speak on these matters.

A.V. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium (Tsessiskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug): Dear comrade deputies. Many critical comments have been addressed to the secretariat and to me personally, connected with the fact that at the morning session the secretariat was unable to organize in a clear-cut way the registration of the lists and requests, particularly requests on statements on the matters that were discussed here before the recess. The criticisms were justified, and all I can do is explain why this happened. You yourselves saw how at first, unfortunately, we started the work imprecisely, and the notes were set in two rows. One went to the secretariat, and the other to the presidium. When we tried to combine the two, the numeration of the requests to speak was, unfortunately, confused. Now, during registration everyone has had an opportunity to obtain special blank forms that can be filled out if you wish to speak on any particular issue. There are, in our opinion, two very important notes that should be made: the time of presentation of your statement and the note of the secretariat. This will make it possible to determine the sequence of statements precisely.

It must be said that the secretariat has received a great deal of material, and everyone in the secretariat is now busy analyzing these materials. Tomorrow morning at the start of the congress' work, if it has the opportunity, the secretariat will briefly inform you about what it has received today and what it is doing to deal with particular documents.

A few words about the procedure for the upcoming discussion of the report from the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet—first, giving due consideration to the importance of matter under review, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Provisional Rules, the congress presidium will take into account the requests of deputies representing republic delegations. Second, we have arranged—and this is also stated in the Provisional Regulations for the congress—that at least three delegates from each all-union republic delegation will be given time to speak. But this quota will be increased depending on the numerical makeup of the republic delegation. Accordingly, each republic may offer any number of speakers in a sequence that is desirable for the delegation. We ask the leaders of delegations to pass a list of speakers to the congress secretariat. In this case these proposals will be considered to be the basis for organization of the discussions.

Third, there is a proposal to give the floor to speakers in the order that the all-union republics are listed in the USSR Constitution. Here, after every third speaker one deputy, either from a region of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] or from the public organizations will be given an opportunity to speak. There is another request that in order to ensure procedure in the discussions, we ask all those who wish to express their opinions on any particular issue to make use of the blank forms that have been prepared by the secretariat.

M.S. Gorbachev: Are there any questions for Comrade Gorbunov? There are, Comrade Skokov, please.

Yu.V. Skokov: (Inaudible).

A.V. Gorbunov: Comrades, we are not forcing anyone to fill in blank forms over and over to speak just because he has not filled out the form. We shall consider literally all requests received, whether or not on the forms. However, for the sake of order I would very much like to appeal to the deputies from the republics. I understand that now the problem of the RSFSR is again arising. But the order for giving the floor to deputies from regions of the RSFSR or from the public organizations after every three speeches to some extent blunts this problem, if I may put it that way. But I would like deputies from the republics to decide for themselves at least the first and second speakers since the number of speakers is not restricted. Notwithstanding, it is essential that we have some kind of organizational foundation, and then we shall see.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Shalayev, please, the question.

S.A. Shalayev: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Gorbunov is now repeating what it is about.

A.V. Gorbunov: Permit me once again. In my opinion the public organizations here will be given greater opportunities. Because, first, the republic representatives themselves will not forget the public organizations, and moreover, within the republics there are deputies from the public organizations. Let me say it again: It is proposed after every three speeches to offer one deputy either from a region of the RSFSR or from the public organizations the opportunity to speak.

From the hall: There is a proposal that a report be made at the morning session through the secretariat on which deputies will be given the floor, so as not to cause a crush by the wall near the dais. If anyone does not agree then it will be decided by the secretariat. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Krayko, please. You have a question?

A.N. Krayko, sector chief in the P.I. Baranov Central Institute of Aviation Engine Building (Baumanskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow city): Yes, the deputies from Russia make up almost half the number and so let one speak—this is a correct proposal—one or perhaps two of them should be given the floor, because otherwise there may be extended speeches from the republic.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, please, what is your opinion?

From the hall: I make bold to state that there will be no extended speeches from Latvia or from the other republics.

M.S. Gorbachev: Permit me, speaking from the chair and on the basis of our general opinion, nevertheless to make the following accurate remark: We cannot set one deputy against another. Let us cast this aside, stop pinning labels on people, along with all suspicions and all doubts, you understand me? Each person has his own viewpoint, good, bad, ill-considered or not, and let us respect them. (Applause). I think that we shall all support such a position so that all long-windedness is taken into account. What if we do have to spend another day if we see that this is needed so that deputies can speak? So tell me, what does it cost us to add time? (Applause). This is within our power. It is a question of holding the congress in such a way that the voices of all the republics and all the public organizations are heard. This is what it is really about! I think that we have allocated time enough for the discussions, which will enable deputies to speak.

From the hall: (Inaudible).

A.G. Kostenyuk, chairman of the Orenburg Oblast soviet of people's deputies ispolkom [executive committee] (Buguruslanskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Orenburg Oblast): Quite right. What the secretariat has announced is only for an organizational start, because we have to start somehow, more systematically, as Mikhail Sergeyevich has said, so that the republics and the public organizations and the regions of Russia all have their say. But this does not exclude the possibility that the lists may be long or that each deputy will be able to submit his request. And the secretariat will register it and accept it and there need be no questions about it here.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

From the hall: The day before yesterday we voted to have the lists with the requests to speak annulled until after the speech of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and to submit them after the report. If we announce these lists then we might just as well not have voted. Then we shall have to vote all over again.

A.V. Gorbunov: Comrades, we really do have a problem here, but the secretariat is not to blame. Yes, an announcement was indeed made that we shall start the lists after the report. However, we have 80 requests. People started to submit them yesterday toward the end of the day, and a particularly large number have been submitted today, from this morning. And so we can decide how to act. So what is your specific proposal?

From the hall: Consider either the requests received after the first day, or those submitted after the report. (Remainder inaudible).

A.V. Gorbunov: "Either...or" is impossible. Is this your specific proposal?

From the hall: It was decided to annul them. We voted in favor of all requests.... (Remainder inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Then let me help. Comrades, this is obviously what must be done: We shall confirm our general opinion that the list should be opened at the start of the report.

From the hall: Correct.

A.V. Gorbunov: The secretariat will be very grateful for this solution.

M.S. Gorbachev: Shall we confirm this? Those in favor please signify. Please put down your hands. Against? Abstentions? Well if there are they are very few.

So, we confirm it: The list is opened again from scratch, using the blank forms, starting tomorrow with the speech. We have resolved the issue. But the other matter that Comrade Gorbunov proposed concerning long-windedness during the discussions is worth supporting, comrades. And this does not exclude the possibility that

during the course of the debates we may decide to limit time.... Yes, we have not made a final decision on this; we shall decide together when to wind up the debates. Is there anything else?

From the hall: I would like.... (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: In general this will not interfere with what has been suggested. And there the opportunity is ensured for statements from public organizations and from scientists; it can be combined. And at the same time equality, the equal position of deputies, will not be infringed upon....

One moment.... Please.

From the hall: I have the following question. Comrade Gorbunov has said that the delegation leader will decide the order of speakers and the number of speakers. I do not really understand all this terminology. We are not delegates, but sovereign delegates. And what do you have in mind when you talk about a delegation? What does delegation mean? What does delegation leader mean? Please explain for us: Are we delegates or deputies, sovereign and answerable only to our electorate, rather than to the leaders of the delegations? And in general, can we even use this expression—delegation leader? (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: First, I did not say that the leader of a delegation will decide who speaks. I am repeating what I wrote, so I can repeat it accurately: We ask the leaders of delegations to pass a list of speakers to the congress secretariat. I said this so that we might have some kind of organizational start for the first speeches. And it seemed to me that a delegation, at least a delegation from a republic, would be able to determine who (just the first two) would speak so as to avoid claims and in order that we could choose who was to be third or fourth. I again emphasize that each deputy is of course sovereign, independent, and so forth.

From the hall: Can you please explain what you mean by delegation leader? What is this?

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades! Let us dismiss this altogether. You register your names. The secretariat and presidium will determine the order of speaking, and we will try to observe democracy, and long-windedness and diversity of opinion will be accepted. Of course we shall be criticized; there will be more criticism of us. But evidently this cannot be avoided.

From the hall: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: All right. This is how we will do it.

The deputy groups from each republic are doing their work. Up to now they have resolved all questions and have put forward collective proposals. Let the deputy groups also decide and choose those from among themselves who will speak. And let the deputy groups pass on their proposals to the secretariat. Is this acceptable?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: It is. Then perhaps we can resolve it in this way. Comrade Stankevich, do you have anything to say on this matter? Anything to add? Fine. Please.

S.V. Stankevich, senior scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of General History (Cheremushkinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow city): There is a proposal to introduce a problematical principle into our debate on tomorrow's report. It seems to me that it will not be quite right if first we have statements on literature and then on economics and then on national questions, and then again on literature. Perhaps in the requests that we shall be submitting we should indicate at least approximately the field, the problem field, on which a deputy intends to speak.

From the hall: (Commotion in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: But this is a matter for the deputy! We shall only accept this in the presidium and secretariat if you describe the problems on which you wish to speak. This would not be bad. But is is, so to speak, dependent on the good will of the deputy. Can we consider that we are agreed on the proposals that Comrade Gorbunov has put forward, even though they are of somewhat limited import? Fine, we are agreed.

Now, comrades, let us move on to what we promised, to the discussions with reference to procedural matters concerning their conduct and order, and other matters on which we have agreed to conduct the debates during the course of this meeting.

So, Comrade Salambek Naibovich Khadzhiyev from the Groznenskiy Territorial Okrug No 396 complains that we have for a long time been ignoring his request. Please.

And Comrade Kiselev from Kamchatka, even though it seems that we have heard him and have exchanged opinions with him during every recess, seems to be saying that Kamchatka is not being given the floor.... Well, let us agree as follows: You are next, and then we shall move on to the congress secretariat list as written: comrades Burykh, Kashnikov, Chernyshev, Chimpoy, Zaslavskiy and others. Please.

Let us make just one stipulation: Statements on procedural matters should not be allowed to last 15 minutes as for the Rules, but 5.... Let us not make claims against the presidium. I think that 5 minutes is adequate for these matters. So? To the point, on procedural matters, motives for voting, and requests submitted, the time will be 3 minutes. But I think that here what we are dealing

with is not quite procedural matters. Let us set 5 minutes, based on the fact that otherwise we shall have to add extra time. Is this acceptable?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: So, 5 minutes. Those in favor please raise your hands. Thank you. Against? Abstentions? Well, we are agreed. Please, proceed on this basis.

S.N. Khadzhiyev, general director of the "Grosneftekhim" Scientific Production Association, Groznyy city (the Groznenskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, the Checheno-Ingush ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]): I am immediately beset by difficulties; they have been building up over the 4 days that I have been trying to get to the dais. I do not know how to restructure a report just immediately, but I shall try.

First, on procedure. I would like to substantiate some of the points in my own statement, which was why I wanted to do this, although in the main I want to speak after the report. I think that it occurred first because it is high time that each of us deputies should, in my opinion, define aloud his own position at the congress so that his electorate can know it. The congress is complex, you see.

Even though it is now considered bad form to say anything good about the leaders, this is how it is, notwithstanding the group of delegates from Checheno-Ingush is convinced that many of the positive processes taking place in our country are associated largely with Mikhail Sergeyevich and his colleagues. And we understand the complexity in which he finds himself. On the one hand there is pressure from the right, when everyone says that there is anarchy in the country and the people are falling apart. On the other hand, you have seen the pressure from the left. There is in principle, naturally, an overwhelming majority , and I include myself in that number, who all support Mikhail Sergeyevich and his actions.

Notwithstanding I have a sense of concern that with each passing day the congress is shifting increasingly toward the right. I would like to think that this is nothing but a feeling.

The second reason for my statement is that I am convinced that we shall achieve the aims of restructuring only on condition that, while giving Mikhail Sergeyevich every possible kind of support, we of necessity subject his actions to well-considered and constructive criticism. Mankind has not invented and cannot think of a better way to avoid error than collective discussion and serious, benevolent, mutual criticism. This is the kind of criticism that I would like to make, but since I have little time remaining I would like, without going into it deeply, to offer five proposals. I shall just read them and then pass them to the presidium: There is no time.

First proposal. At the expiration of the term of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, leading workers in the presidium should submit their resignations and have the newly elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet select and appoint presidium workers at his own discretion. The first to resign among leading workers in the presidium should be the chairman of the Supreme Soviet at the conclusion of our congress. You know that the start of the congress has been a mess, but notwithstanding we must afford the president the right to such actions. I know that he has power enough to remove them, and to spare. But it is one thing when he removes power and quite another when this is done in accordance with the law. In a rule-of-law state everything should be done according to the law.

Second proposal. To create, starting from today, an organizational group for the congress, made up of cadre deputies, 20 people—one from each of the all-union republics, 2 from Moscow and 3 from workers in the Supreme Soviet and CPSU Central Committee; and to assign this organizational group the task of immediately taking up matters concerned with the organization of this congress and subsequent congresses. We must have this kind of organizational group since the secretariat can deal only with a small range of matters while a colossal group of questions still remains on the side, including matters of an informational nature.

Third. To institute the post of master of ceremonies for the congress sessions. To submit to the presidium proposals on candidates for the post of master of ceremonies of the congress sessions. To have the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet Presidium provide by the morning of the 30th a place for a master of ceremonies of the congress sessions. (Commotion in the hall). One moment; let me explain. You are aware that we are uncomfortable; we have elected a president and the entire world is watching us. And now all the time we are, in general, somehow with him.... So I left, uncomfortable; this is not the way the world does it. The master of ceremonies of the congress should sit with a hefty gavel and two powerful aides. Then I shall not leave. What will you do with me, call in the militia? This is accepted the world over....

M.S. Gorbachev: And we have Comrade Vlasov sitting among us.

S.N. Khadzhiyev: Since he had the power to do it—but I have jumped at the chance and will stay. Nevertheless, I think that there should be a master of ceremonies for the congress, and the presidium should carry out other functions. The members of the presidium should listen to the debate and then discuss it among themselves and offer us a well-considered proposal of generalized formulations for voting. And the fact that the president of the greatest power of all time is sitting here among us as we argue is, in my opinion, not proper. We have been taught from childhood that with the authorities.... In short, I think that this should be done.

Fourth proposal. To elect a procedural group of 10 people and assign them the task of preparing by 30 May a draft procedure for conducting the debates and adopting decisions. Apart from this one question, we still have an earlier question that has not been declared, and no one is in principle prepared to move into this confusion. There must be clear-cut procedures: How to bring up a matter, who brings up a matter, how much time is allotted for discussion. I, for example, am a categorical opponent of having a vote by a majority preventing people from speaking; this does not occur in a normal parliament. Other matters should be prepared by this procedural commission in time for the fall session of the congress. But we should at least make a start on them now.

And finally. This is our first congress. The entire world is watching us. It has seemed to me that it would be proper, Mikhail Sergeyevich—and I hope that the people's deputies will support this—if we prepared on behalf of the congress an appeal to all peoples and parliaments of the world, setting forth our position on the most important issues.

So there you have it, the fifth proposal that I would like to introduce. Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, let us pass the proposals to the presidium as a matter of importance, and at appropriate stages in the work of the congress express our opinion on these very important and interesting issues. Are there any objections? So resolved.

Comrade Kiselev will be the next to have the floor. And then Comrade Burykh.

V.N. Kiselev, engineer in the organizational-legal section of the V.I. Lenin Fish Farming Collective Farm [kolkhoz], Petropavlovsk-Kamchatka city (Kamchatka Territorial Electoral Okrug, Kamchatka Oblast): Respected comrade people's deputies of the USSR. Before making my statement I would like to ask you to open bulletin No 3 at page 20. We all say that under the conditions of glasnost and democracy we cannot hold back the truth in the history of our state. Today we are making history. Look at what is written at the bottom of page 20, what Fedorov said. We all remember his speech. There has been a hail of telegrams: Voters are asking that he make a public apology, but the bulletin writes that Comrade Fedorov said. "Vote for whomever you please. If you want clever people, fine, if you do not, fine." But in the speech he used the expression "if you want fools." This kind of bulletin also causes mistrust about all decisions. In this connection I ask that the name of the person who permitted this inaccuracy be disclosed. And the names of the deputies who prepared it should appear beneath every law, beneath every program. (Applause).

Comrade people's deputies. We are all indignant about the procedure that has taken shape at the congress, when they "slam the door" on a people's deputy making a statement. I consider this kind of conduct improper. Moreover, according to all the rules, it is impossible to speak out to criticize a speaker. I can express my own opinion and only discuss the report. Why are we acting in this way? Each deputy has the right to express his opinion, and we shall decide whose positive to support.

Next question. I believe that today our working presidium is more for show. And in this connection I propose that the following factors be added to the working presidium. Today the working presidium must strictly observe that today's work be conducted according to the rules. It is necessary to formulate more precisely whose statements should be heard. We have seen the special blank forms that have been prepared and have now been distributed to us. And at the same time, whoever has not spoken has the right to submit his statement to the secretariat so that it can be duplicated and circulated among all people's deputies on the next day.

I have repeatedly submitted written requests to the secretariat (for 2 days I had no vote at the congress) asking them to give us the materials from the meeting of the council of representatives of the deputies, where many issues were resolved, and from the meeting of the party group, where Comrade Shekhovtsov challenged the candidature of the chairman of the Constitutional Oversight Committee. All deputies should know about this. For some reason the materials have still not been distributed to us.

Next question. I believe that all delegations should have an equal opportunity to appear on central television, offer its assessment to the congress, and appear in print in the press. Unfortunately, the country knows all the celebrities and they continue to speak out. This is fundamentally wrong and it brings discredit to the work of the other people's deputies.

Next question—a procedural one. I believe that in order to avoid mistakes in the future (and we do have the elections to the all-union republics coming up) all the people should elect the head of state and head of government, not us, just a certain part of the representatives of the people.

Next. I believe that the head of government and the head of state should take an oath to the people. It is essential to set some age qualification for appointment to state posts. We have already elected a chairman for the Supreme Soviet and the chairman's first deputy. I do not object to Anatoliy Ivanovich; he and I have talked about having these points in the draft of a new constitution. My request is to Mikhail Sergeyevich and to the people's deputies, and is as follows. In accordance with the Provisional Rules that have been proposed here, the chairman will recommend to us the names of candidates for the Constitutional Oversight Committee. And who then will monitor the activity of the Supreme Soviet and

recommend and name a procurator general and a chairman for the People's Control Committee? In this connection I suggest, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that perhaps our opinions will coincide, but you should know the opinions both of the voters and of the people's deputies. As you said at the 19th all-union party conference, today we must not dictate, but must hold discussions and carry on a dialogue, respect the opinions of the voters, and introduce proposals on the basis of of those opinions. But our opinions probably will coincide with respect to Ryzhkov and other comrades.

In concluding my statement I would like to bring to your attention certain telegrams that I have selected from the larger mass of telegrams. "In turning down your own program for the creation of a rule-of-law state you have violated the Constitution. Where is your courage? There is no Supreme Soviet or accountability report, yet a chairman has been elected."

This, comrades, is not my opinion, but the opinion of the voters.

Many voters, myself included—and in conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich we have discussed this matter—have come to the common opinion that today Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin should also be taking part in the country's public and political life. Since I feel that I will have no further opportunity to speak, I propose that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin be considered for the post of chairman of the People's Control Committee. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Burykh has the floor. Next will be Comrade Kashnikov.

Yu.Ye. Burykh, chief of the technical department at the Gorlovka Chemical Plant, Gorlovka city (the Gorlovka Territorial Electoral Okrug, Donetsk Oblast): Respected chairman, respected colleagues. I shall lose my self-respect and the trust of the voters, and we shall all lose it, if we are not candid and proper. In connection with the work of the congress and its first results, the political situation in the capital, and indeed throughout the country, is ambiguous. On Saturday after the congress work was completed we, the group of deputies from Donetsk Oblast, met indignant Muscovites at the Moskva hotel, who literally demanded explanations about the results of the elections to the Supreme Soviet, and demanded explanations about the failure to elect Deputy Yeltsin. The Muscovites were dissatisfied with our answer and they invited us to their meeting on Sunday. I was there. And what happened? There was intense dissipation of political indifference and apathy. This is healthy. Society is being revived and people are learning to discuss very important state affairs. But this learning is going on, at least in Moscow, without alternative opinions, in a somewhat one-sided fashion.

Yesterday at the meeting I tried to express opinions that I knew beforehand would not be approved by some of those present. My objections were directed toward the wisdom of the Muscovites, their common sense, and toward movement in constitutional positions. The rapture of democracy and glasnost that has grown up among us, and dissatisfaction with the results of the elections to the Supreme Soviet, have led some comrades to the conclusion that urgent and extreme measures are needed. Who will explain to the people that there are other democratic ways to influence public opinion about the work of the congress? Can no one prove to the Muscovites the correctness of the outcome of the elections to the Supreme Soviet? This, I think, is where appeals and arguments from deputies Meshalkin and Samsonov would be useful.

I was extremely surprised not to see soviet or party workers among those speaking at the meeting. People are saying candidly that political leaders do not want to hear the people. What are they waiting for?

Respected members of the Politburo, you are also people's deputies, so go out among the people, look at party history and practice. The Bolsheviks went to the meetings and demonstrations, into the regiments and barracks, even when they no longer controlled a situation. They convinced the people and took them along with them. Let us remember that Lenin called alienation from the people communist self-conceit. Otherwise your failure to participate in political discussion may be regarded as a withdrawal from the discussion of urgent problems.

Let us look the truth in the eyes. If we favor the building of a rule-of-law state not in words but in deeds, then we should recognize in a number of cases that we are retreating from the USSR Constitution. The results of the ballot on the elections to the Supreme Soviet have in general not been understood among the people, nor in the congress. What I saw during the course of the voting was group voting by show of hands, when, standing or sitting, in groups of two or three, people compared the bulletin with the lists of candidates. For the bulletins did not indicate job or place of work. We are complaining to the congress and proposing that a commission be set up on the violations during the course of the election of people's deputies at the local level, to conduct a careful investigation of individual instances of this. And now here we are at the congress, violating the ballot procedure and causing mistrust. If the voters could see the voting procedure, you and I would not be sitting here in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Mikhail Sergeyevich really does not want one of the deputies to write in his memoirs 30 years from now that at the 1st Congress of People's Deputies it was noted that there were violations of the Fundamental Law—the Constitution of the USSR—and that they were not put right. Our people are tired of the stresses resulting from revelations made after the fact. It would be proper to consider the possibility of voting again on the makeup of

the Supreme Soviet. In this way we would affirm loyalty to the Constitution and calm the voters. Now, with the experience that has been gained, there would be no time for that. I think that the respected chairman of the congress presidium should take a more well-considered attitude toward statements about the occurrence of a conflict situation, split and crisis. Our work is difficult and complex, but nevertheless we are moving ahead. For me there is no crisis in the congress and this will not happen. Whoever has passed through the crucible of the election struggle and has been truly elected from a whole list of candidates, has not been shaken by the statements from deputies Afanasyev, Popov and Adamovich. Their courageous, sharply critical, and emotional view of the course of the congress shocked those who had a relatively smooth election campaign. And there is no need to feel offended, comrades.

It is a secret to no one that deputies vary with respect to the strategy of restructuring. Some are for making restructuring according to a plan from above, others favor doing it through permanent and valid consultation with the people, through living practice and common sense—that is, favor democratic restructuring. In one case this is the earlier monopoly on the truth, with an obedient, resigned people, and in the other it is checking the course of restructuring and the practical work and opportunity of all Soviet people. There is no need to rush to proclaim the delirium of the thoughts and proposals of deputies. There is no need to proclaim as critical political careerists those who think otherwise: On the one hand they are in no way "enemies of the people"; on the other hand, we ourselves might become "careerists." But I make bold to assert that the main thing is that the entire mess of problems in the work of the congress has come about not because of the actions of a minority, but in connection with the retreat from the problem of confirming the key role of the congress of people's deputies in exercising the highest level of state power and by amendments or decree, strengthening the exclusive right of the congress to adopt USSR laws. Here it must be pointed out on a mandatory basis that the Supreme Soviet is a working organ executing the will of the congress.

Unfortunately, up to now this kind of proposal, heard from some deputies from Moscow and Donetsk oblasts, has remained unanswered, and has not even been put to the vote, even partially. This is what happened with the proposal on voting again for the makeup of the Council of Nationalities, put forward at the previous session.

I think that it would now be useful to assign to the presidium the task of setting up a commission on legislative initiatives made by people's deputies during the course of the discussions, so that they may be reviewed at the end of the work of the congress. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Kashnikov has the floor. Next to speak will be Comrade Chernyshev.

N.I. Kashnikov, senior teacher in a department of the Kumertauskiy evening faculty of the Ufa Sergo Ordzhonikidze Aviation Institute (Kumertauskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Bashkir ASSR): Respected chairman. Respected deputies. In a number of the statements by deputies the thought has crept in that there should be no further discussion of procedural matters. It seems to me that M.S. Gorbachev is profoundly correct when he proposes that the discussion continue on these, if you like, fundamental questions.

It has been said here that some voters will die from indignation and others from laughing at the exaggeration of these matters by Muscovites, Leningraders and other deputies. It seems to me that the voters have every cause for indignation if some deputies underestimate these key problems of our first congress. For it is precisely today, at this congress, that a mechanism will be created for our highest organs of power; it is precisely today that, thanks entirely to the procedure that is devised, we shall either obtain capable, competent organs, or after the congress there will be disillusioned voters. Let me give you just one illustration. Here today the peripheral deputies are justifiably indignant that the places in the hall do not make for equal opportunity when we speak. As it has been said here, we are "out in Kamchatka," far away from the dais and the microphone. But this situation is also the result of procedure, a procedure that has made it a complicated matter to express our opinions, while it has made it simple for others. And the ability or inability to represent a particular viewpoint that may influence the adoption of the best decisions depends on this. That is what happened during the formation of the highest organs of power: Thanks to the procedures for their formation, they can be more or less restructured. Our task is to make them more restructured. Accordingly, there should henceforth be a real choice of alternative candidates, both for the post of chairman and for the seats on the Supreme Soviet. And today we should listen to all viewpoints on procedure for shaping true democracy.

Comrades. The failure of the group of deputies from Moscow to accept many of the peripheral deputies is largely explained, it seems to me, on psychological grounds. Without going into the essential nature of what is proposed by deputies from Moscow, but assessing their activity as demagoguery in procedural matters, as a claim to monopoly of the congress, many of us "provincials" have an adverse attitude toward the Muscovites. This is precisely why many of the Muscovites favor the features of the Supreme Soviet. It seems to me that this kind of approach by the Muscovites is incorrect. Yes, today they make up a minority, but they are not alone. Many of the "provincials" are sharing their constitutional views. I also share their constructive views.

History shows that the minority is not always wrong. Remember Lenin. Lenin was several times in a minority but was ultimately shown to be right. I do not exclude the possibility that today the Muscovites are right in many,

but not all, questions. And what if something of value can be extracted from their programs for the national state program to bring the country out of its critical situation? I therefore propose that the group of Moscow deputies should be given half-an-hour for a co-report after Comrade Gorbachev or after the report from Comrade Ryzhkov. (Applause). Why should we deprive them of this right just because they have their own views on ways to deal with the critical situation in the country if they really have done their work? I propose that time be allotted for the group of Moscow deputies for a co-report, or statement, as you wish. And if we find anything that is personally acceptable for adoption, then it should be adopted. This is normal parliamentary practice and we must start to shape democratic traditions. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Chernyshev, for the USSR Union of Designers, has the floor. The following speaker will be Deputy Chimpoy.

O.V. Chernyshev, chief of the design department at the Belorussian State Theatrical-Artistic Institute, Minsk city (for the USSR Union of Designers): Respected comrade deputies, respected comrade voters and the many millions now watching this on television. The philosophy of Marxism contains the proposition that history develops in a dialectic fashion according to dialectic laws. But dialectics must wait a very long time for history. Today we have been waiting for the historical chance and we have received it from the hands of Mikhail Sergeyevich. It is an historical chance that will perhaps give us an opportunity to save the country in the full meaning of the word. But the fact is that it is not only the supporters of restructuring who have been given this chance, but also its opponents. And therefore a fierce struggle—I do not fear to use this word—is under way, a fierce, internal and hidden struggle. There was a fierce struggle during the process of the election campaign and there is one here, at the congress. Our society is seriously ill. The disease has spread throughout almost all levels in the structure of its organization. We are well aware of this from material in the press, and indeed from life itself. These are the bleeding wounds on the body of our society—national questions, questions of the ecology and the economy, questions of inflation, and so forth. And we should remember that there are wounds on our bodies, on every one of us. But the strangest thing is that many of the wounds are the marks of the act of our political surgeons who have learned very well the article of cutting, but have not learned the article of sewing and joining together. I say this because the lesson of our congress is now being received by people throughout the country. How the congress goes, so too will go life. This, our democratic congress, will be duplicated in the form that we today decide, and millions and millions of copies will be made.

Lenin said that whoever tries to solve particular questions without solving general questions will always be stumbling over them and going back to them, and thus any advance will be hampered. Therefore, questions concerning the Rules are question number one, the most important questions, because only the Rules can reflect democracy in living form. From where did we start? We started from questions of the agenda. For logic demands this: We have come here for the many, many millions of voters. The voters have given us their instructions. That is, we are not just simply Sidorovs and Petrovs and Ivanovs. We are the bearers of the people's will. And we must all therefore recognize the real problems, which are sometimes glossed over. And we see that Mikhail Sergeyevich does not always see these living wounds accurately or in high relief. That is, he is given information that has already been somewhat biased. So that if we were to discuss these problems we would reveal the most important problems, and their causes, and draw up a program of action, and elect people who would engage in these actions under our vigilant eye, and with our help. This has not happened, because the congress has been making somersaults on the first questions that we must resolve right from the start. It must therefore be said that the 1st Congress of People's Deputies is a congress of missed opportunities. Yes, its efficiency is greater than all preceding congresses, but much less than the opportunities that through us should be representing our people. The fact is that the procedures that we have already implemented are an example of how easily and imperceptibly—sometimes under merry commotion, sometimes intoxicated by the air of these Kremlin walls, by the fact that we, simple people from among the people, are even here, and under the influence of this facile and even somewhat euphoric mood—we have resolved some issues, and, moreover, technical, procedural issues, in our present situation today. We have elected a head of state—that is, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet— a Supreme Soviet, and a deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Tell me, please, how anyone here could think that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev could fail to be elected if there were only three other candidates? Personally I have no doubts that if this had happened there would have been a national riot. I am convinced of this. But you understand what has happened: We used to have this leader, and we still have him. We used to have a traditional agenda, and we still have it. We used to have a Supreme Soviet, elected traditionally, and in principle appointed, and so the republics voted, not the congress. Because wherever the votes accurately matched the quota, no one was introduced there. All we have paid for all this with democracy. Is this not too high a price? (Applause). Because both the letter and the spirit of the law have been violated. But the fact is that as soon as we touch the letter the spirit goes out of the law. And this is always what happens. Here I observe very dangerous trends. I have been forced to rush along. Marx said that if it is not consciously directed but is random, culture leaves behind a desert. I believe that the actions against Sakharov that took place here is already the beginning of that desert. We may obliterate all the things we hold dear

in this way. It would be.... There is no need for commotion. It would be as if the Vysotskiy had appeared today. These are people, they are the conscience of our nation. (Applause).

Comrades, do not applaud, my time is short.

M.S. Gorbachev: Your time has run out.

O.V. Chernyshev: One second only. I.... The fact is that everything is so quick.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

O.V. Chernyshev: I ask, comrades, that we be able to speak for as long as we wish. One second. For the fact is that what this is is a collection of the popular wisdom. If a person wants to speak for a long time, let him. Next time he will say nothing at all. Because the time spent here will be time given back for restructuring. The more we sit here and make use of this wisdom, the better we shall know how to act. They are calling us to work.

M.S. Gorbachev: That is all. Deputy Chimpoy has the floor. The following speaker will be comrade Ilya Iosifovich Zaslavskiy.

M.I. Chimpoy, writer, secretary of the Moldavian SSR Writer's Union, Kishinev city (Kishinev-Dnestrovsk National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moldavian SSR): Respected comrade chairman. Respected comrade deputies. I am very disturbed by the course of this congress. During the first 4 days there were undoubtedly bright democratic elements. But it is also beyond dispute that we are passing over very important problems. It might even be said that we are steamrolling over them. The initiatives of Latvia and many of the businesslike initiatives of Moscow, and other ideas, have been crushed. I therefore propose the creation of a commission to study the platform of the group of Moscow deputies. We must necessarily urgently define the status of people's deputy, giving due consideration to the fact that some of our colleagues, as, for example, Dumitru Matkovskiy from Moldavia, have already become the tragic victims of strange road accidents. The antirestructuring decision against suspending the decree on meetings and demonstrations lies like a dense shadow over our congress. Voters are telephoning me constantly about this, and calling our congress antipopular. Will it not be, dear colleagues, that we come to the Kremlin as people's deputies but will leave as antipopular deputies? (Applause). In order to restore immediately the congress's lost prestige I propose that the question of suspending the decree of 8 April be put to a roll-call vote. And the list of those voting in favor of and against be made public. (Applause). For it may happen that we shall fight for a long time to save people who will be thrown into prison simply because they participated in discussion of the work of our congress. Up to now we still do not know the sponsor of the 8 April decree. So it is an anonymous decree. And as you know, we have no truck with anonymity. (Applause).

We must also conduct a full vote on a resolution of the tragedy in Tbilisi. We must do this right now, and hear without delay an answer to the request of the Latvian delegate on the tragedy in Tbilisi, and to the request of some of the Moldavian group of deputies about the eight innocent citizens, who took part the 12 March demonstration, being held along with criminals, and to other similar requests. This is very important because we must vote for a procurator general and other high officials. I would like to hear the attitude of Comrade Sukharev on all these problems.

To continue, our congress is dealing with national questions in a way that has in recent times become generally accepted in our country. They are either debated for a long time and made artificially complicated, or they go unremarked, ignored. The error with the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast in the voting procedure was very eloquent in this regard. Thank God that it was revealed immediately and in a constructive way. I think that from this moment on it is essential to prepare a clear-cut resolution on national problems, in particular on statehood and on the functioning of national languages. I propose the following deputies from Moldavia to work on this resolution: Drutse, Viera, and Lari. And I ask my colleagues from the republics to support their nomination. I believe that the historic mission that has been laid on our congress simply obliges it to be a true model of democratism, and that it must in no way pass over the important problems, no matter what the procedural formulas.

There is another factor just as important. If we offer criticism that criticism should be constructive. We must beware of the eulogizing, dithyrambic tone that we heard, for example, in the speech of our colleague from Moldavia, Nelli Pavlovna Kiriyak. I would very much like our congress to be not like a young virgin, as my colleague from Kazakhstan, Olzhas Suleymenov said, but like a serious and mature man.

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Zaslavskiy from Territorial Electoral Okrug No 17, Moscow, has the floor. The following speaker will be Comrade Yastrebov from Udmurtiya.

I.I. Zaslavskiy, scientific associate at the Moscow A.N. Kosygin Textile Institute (Oktyabrskiy Electoral Okrug, Moscow): Respected chairman, respected congress deputies. I waged my election campaign and came here in order to raise questions about the disabled and the safeguarding of their interests. However, this is now the third time that I have spoken on procedural matters. I am speaking because experience in dealing with social problems shows graphically that the one depends upon the other. Social questions depend on economic questions, and economic questions on political questions.

And political questions cannot be resolved without real rights and powers for those elected by the people. And it is therefore essential that procedure be regulated properly, and that all deputies have an opportunity to express their opinions and make their contribution to the general decision of the congress and participate actively in the work of its organs.

I suggest that to some extent it is procedural matters that have determined the complex situation that came about yesterday, since everyone said that much work was needed, and I fully agree with that. But people who have worked a great deal, for almost 2 months, preparing proposals, have been unable to familiarize themselves with the congress proposals. Why? Because a procedural matter was violated. They decided that documents submitted by delegations should be duplicated and distributed. But up to now this has not been done.

Because of this, people have not known about our materials beforehand, and have only seen one node of problems, and this has created the complexity. It seems to me that it is very important that the congress now show in its further work the lessons of demonstrable democracy, so as to remove all accusations of being antidemocratic. This can be achieved only if our further elections take place on an alternative basis.

Naturally, there arise here complexities connected with the Constitution, since the head of state must propose candidates, but the Constitution does not stipulate the possibility that he may propose only one candidate. In principle it is possible to conduct ballots of several candidates proposed by the head of state. At the same time it would also make sense to elect the first deputies here at the congress for the top workers confirmed here, such as, for example the chairman of the Supreme Court or the chairman of the Council of Ministers, giving due consideration to the interests of the all-union republics. This would be proper and correct, it seems to me, and would again offer an example of democracy at our congress.

I therefore propose alternative elections for the posts of chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the Supreme Court, and for other leading workers, who should be confirmed by our congress or elected by it. I also propose (and this is not my proposal alone, but the proposal of the voters who have sent me to the congress, a proposal with almost 1,100 signatures) that each deputy have an opportunity to speak at the congress if he submits a request to do so, since each of us represents a large number of voters and their pains and desires, so that life may be better. Naturally, time limits are a given, but we should have first discussed the possibility of, for example, publishing in the central press the statements that are not heard at the congress. This has still not been done.

It seems to me that this must be done, and I offer the following proposal. Our bulletin is being circulated only among deputies, but voters have a right to know what viewpoint their deputy is expressing and what he is defending here.

It seems to me that from this standpoint it is very important that as soon we can do it, from the technical angle, we should conduct a roll-call vote and introduce for each of us some kind of registration list where we shall note what we voted for and what we voted against. A people's deputy has been given the trust of an enormous number of people, and naturally he will write the truth on his own list since it will not be automatically monitored. We ourselves must monitor ourselves. This would be right, and the results of those lists should be published so that people would know who voted for what. And if some different reading appears then that, it seems to me, would be interesting. This is the second proposal.

And the last proposal that I would like to introduce. It seems to me that tomorrow, when the debate on the report takes place, it should be conducted, as Sergey Borisovich Stankevich has said, according to subject—that is, a separate subject for each section of the report, so that one statement may dispute with another. Ultimately the collective wisdom of the congress would arrive at some specific proposal. I support the proposal on the co-report. It will provide an opportunity to consider the great preparatory work done before the congress by many deputies who from the very first day have been trying to prepare sometimes and work and offer their own contribution to the congress treasure house. They have also been trying to publish an appeal to all other deputies in the newspaper IZVESTIYA. Unfortunately, this initiative has not been published. Because of this we have a situation in which some have participated in the preparatory activity while some have not.

I propose that one day of the congress be set aside specially for social and ecology problems because these are problems on which our society now rests, problems that are very acute, problems to which people are very sensitive. We must discuss them seriously and define at least some basic directions along which the country should move. This is my third and final proposal. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Aleksey Zakharovich Yastrebov, deputy for the 394th Territorial Electoral Okrug, has the floor. The following speaker will be Comrade Nikolay Alekseyevich Strukov from Kursk.

A.Z. Yastrebov, deputy chief technologist at the Sarapul Ordzhonikidze Radio Plant, Sarapul city (Kamskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Udmurt ASSR): Honored guests of the congress. Respected colleague deputies. Taking advantage of the fact that the speaker before me was a representative of the Moscow group of deputies, I cannot help but note the following paradox: just as it was when the Rus used to lead us, any initiative is punishable, and the Moscow group, like no other group, was working

actively in the 2 months before the congress and has prepared a package of specific and well-worked proposals. We must criticize not this Moscow group, but all the other groups that have come empty-handed to the congress. (Applause). And next time the work of the group of deputies should be assessed precisely by the following principle: if you come empty-handed and without a package of proposals, that is how you will be assessed.

On the specific subject of procedure. I am disturbed by the following: We do have microphones in the hall, but have they just been placed along the aisles as a decorative framing for the congress? These microphones should be switched on whenever deputies are given the opportunity to ask questions on the essence of the problems on the agenda that are being considered. These questions will not be at all topical and will lose their meaning if an hour, or even half-an-hour has passed. It is essential to provide an opportunity for the microphones to be used when questions are asked.

Next proposal. I have the impression that our presidium is not a worker presidium, as we have called it, but an honorary presidium. Essentially just the chairman is working. Of course, he is just one person, despite all his capabilities and opportunities, and he cannot keep up with everything and oversee everything. I propose a small test for our working presidium. This morning we had a proposal from one of the deputies—the draft rules on voting and on the election of future candidates; let the working presidium over the next two or three days work on this draft and bring it to the congress. If our working presidium—what I have in mind is the 15 representatives from our all-union republics—fails to cope with this task, let another presidium be elected. (Applause).

This is what is happening here: for every new question that is raised we are setting up a commission. If we are all busy working in commissions there will be no congress.

It is necessary to entrust the presidium, and first and foremost the first deputy chairman, with the task of working on and examining all proposals on changing the law on the status of deputies, and on who will speak for groups of deputies and for individual deputies—and this should be done by the last day of the congress. You and I will not leave the congress until we obtain at least the basic amendments to the existing law on the status of deputies. (Applause).

The new law on status must be drawn up carefully and adopted, perhaps, in the fall. But amendments must be adopted here at this congress.

Next remark. The Supreme Soviet will soon begin to set up the committees and commissions. I have the following misgiving on this score. You and I have witnessed how the representative of the Mariy ASSR was omitted from the officially published lists of Supreme Soviet candidates. Perhaps it was an accident, and perhaps it was not. We have received no answer to the question of who struck out that name, and why. I shall not name the name; everyone knows it. I do not speak for that person. The fact is that if we do not now make a specific assessment of whoever did this, then the thing may be repeated with any of us when we are elected to the commissions and committees. (Applause).

Further—and you have drawn attention to this—there are frequent recesses in the work of the congress, and they are not so short either. There is reason, good reason, to organize during one of these recesses a screening of the television film of the events in Tbilisi. (Applause).

I think that this will be quite easy to organize technically. There are two video recorders and four television sets. We should certainly see it.

Finally, permit me to organize a small procedure. I would like to explain thoroughly one question.

Respected deputies and groups of deputies. The question concerns the following procedure: Which of you, which groups, before leaving for Moscow, had received drafts of the documents on the preparations for and holding of today's congress? If you did, then take them out, please, let us see them. There are none. This is precisely why I would like to remark that when Anatoliy Ivanovich talked to us on this matter he was not quite accurate.

Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Nikolay Alekseyevich Strukov has the floor. The following speaker will be Comrade Belozertsev from Petrozavodsk.

N.A. Strukov, senior investigator of the procurator's office for Kursk Oblast, Kursk city (Kursk Territorial Electoral Okrug, Kursk Oblast): The apparatus has a perfect procedural technology and could if it wished ensure a working atmosphere for the congress, and it must do so. Without order and discipline I do not need democracy. The presidium has allowed us to be drawn into unnecessary debates about nonexistent factions, pinning on labels and so forth. We, the potential workers of the congress, have become an amorphous mass trying to get to the dais, rushing to say our piece, more often than not without a subject, chaotically repeating the same thoughts on some problems, and more often than not, it seems, because of a fear of not being heard, as we discuss opinions and try to get closer to the truth. So whither are we rushing?

The day before yesterday, for example, before the work was completed on the discussion of the nomination of candidate Lukyanov, Mikhail Sergeyevich set the quite unnecessary task for the congress of setting up a commission to investigate possible crimes by Gdlyan, outraging the better sensibilities of Ligachev and the Politburo. Today lawyer Lukyanov's statement is murderous: Let whoever wants to consider this matter. And who

wanted to throw himself into these investigations? Extrajudicial trials are illegal here.

The leadership of the courts, the procuracy, the MVD, and the KGB have created in the country the kind of mess that the entire congress could not sort out in a year. What we need a hundred times more is a commission to bring order to the country and organize the work of the law enforcement agencies. These are the things that must be asked, but the leadership of these agencies is now setting the congress the task of the Gdlyan case, rather than the question of privileges and the inaccessibility of the courts to the top people, where information about bribe-taking by delegates to the 19th all-union party conference, and about organized crime, is lost. It is to this that the congress should turn its attention and react.

What is the reason for these shortcomings in the work of the congress? On the basis of the excuse for a law on the elections, and under the leadership of Comrade Lukyanov, an overwhelming majority has been created here, and it has decided and is deciding the main question of the party apparatus, namely, the question of power. They simply will not give other tasks for the congress to resolve. (Applause). Under a call for the renewal of power they are preserving their earlier makeup, without offering an alternative to Gorbachev, maintaining him in the post of general secretary, resolving all matters without alternatives; I think that we shall not have alternatives in the country while this order, or rather disorder, is preserved.

We are throwing the impotent people's deputies with their badges into a sea of complaints from people and indignation on the part of the people. Are we to be the buffer? Not all of us, of course, but the majority, are encountering a wall of China made up of subordinates. When Mikhail Sergeyevich referred to his right to name Lukyanov as his deputy, the person next to me—the party obkom first secretary Seleznev—burst out happily with: "Now we have power." Who? And you are against factions, respected apparatchiki. (Applause). Seleznev should learn, and learn quickly, that power should lie with the congress. And today it must be clearly consolidated by decree, as Sakharov proposed. Otherwise the invisible iron will that we are talking about today will give us cause for concern in the future.

When I compare the work of the congress to the operation of a factory—forgive me for the comparison—I think that its output should be the priority programs, ways and means to implement them promptly, and responsible monitoring of them. We have elected a fine director and leader, and together with him we should have determined our—the deputies'—work program and our status, and have specified rights and obligations. But the comrade president is in no hurry to do this; he is in no hurry to organize good work for the congress.

First it has been necessary to form all the structural subdivisions of the congress; it is a question of the commissions. For today, when he raised the question of the Rules, Mikhail Sergeyevich himself said "the congress should not be interrupted." If we had done this right at the start and formed a structure for the congress, and for its working organs, there would be no need to interrupt it. This should have been considered at the start, but as soon as we failed to form the subdivisions and commissions the result has been chaos. We are again working without a system, irresponsibly, incompetently. For some reason our luminaries are silent. Their word is weighty. And when a "non-Meshalkin" come to the dais there will be no time for empty debates. (Applause).

I propose that we deem a number of the decisions of the credentials and counting commission (of which, incidentally, I am a member) illegal, and annul them. After a commission has been set up, all the commissions under the programs, we must define their priority tasks. The report should be made not on the main directions. We have had more than enough of those reports. The report should be made on the program. And then all those presenting co-reports should introduce proposals on a specific program. And they should be worked on until the next congress, so that it can approve these programs. The people and the deputies must be perplexed [as published]; otherwise once again we shall have no work or concrete results. (Applause).

The party apparatus must give the congress control, and a mechanism that in fact ensures for it the conditions for working in the interests of the people, for we are all saying that we are for the people, but for some reason we are altogether unable to bring the country out of this impasse situation, out of its crises. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Sergey Vladimirovich Belozertsev from Petrozavodsk, the 570th okrug, has the floor. Deputy Barashkov will be next.

S.V. Belozertsev, senior teacher at the Karelian State Pedagogical Institute, Petrozavodsk city (Kalininskiy National-Territorial Okrug, Karelian ASSR): On behalf of my own voters and the Moscow voters I am making a protest about the way that information about the congress is being presented by the [television] program "Vremya," and even in the newspaper IZVESTIYA, where summarized stenographic records are being carried. The voters believe that in the evening it is essential to repeat the work of the congress for those who during the morning and afternoon were unable to watch it, or to totally abandon the tendentious transmission of material.

There is more. Mikhail Sergeyevich, I call on you to abandon the formula "let is take this under advisement," with which the hall must be regaled, with reference to time. They say that a decision on an issue is being delayed because of the discussion of procedural matters for the congress, and they say there are objections. Why

not clearly resolve the "ayes" and "nays" and let the congress itself decide by vote what it will accept or reject?

I would like to share my thoughts on the matter of voting on the decrees on items 504 and 505 of the "Records." I submitted a request to the presidium, but like many other requests, it appears to have disappeared somewhere. The fact is that the overwhelming majority of those present have no information about the content of these decrees. If this information were available, particularly for the comrade agrarians, then they would not be saying that they are doing the plowing while we are holding the endless discussions. They would understand the purpose of those decrees. Much has been said about Decree 504 being antidemocratic, but Decree 505 is an anti-Soviet decree. It removes special-purpose troops from the subordination of the organs of Soviet power. Through this decree we have lost the inviolability of our homes; now anyone may come in just on suspicion, according to its formulation, and without the sanction of the procurator's office and not in response to a court order. And according to this decree, weapons may be used against women and children if they make an armed attack on a colleague.

A poll of MVD representatives, conducted by Leningrad sociologists, showed that a very large proportion of them believe that the child who threatened an MVD worker with a rock is engaging in armed attack. This is quite a dangerous understanding of the vague formulations of this decree. I would like to make a request as a deputy, even if only verbally: My voters and I would like to know all the names of the people who subscribed to this decree, both this one, 504, and Decree 505.

Furthermore, I would like to join Comrade Zaslavskiy on the question of a roll-call vote. Since we have rejected this in favor of a show of hands, then in fact we can have recourse to a procedure whereby one or two people record all those voting for or against on basic issues, so that later the voters will have an opportunity to monitor the people who have violated their interests, and can then be recalled in accordance with procedure for the recall of deputies worked out at our congress. (Applause).

Comrade deputies. I would like to say to you that at their meetings the voters of Moscow are expecting a great deal from you. They want to know your opinions. This is what a small circle at a meeting yesterday assigned me to say: "Comrades, the question is why did Yeltsin leave the Supreme Soviet? This is a fundamental question. Let all those who did not strike out this name on the voting paper wear this badge so that the voters can pose their questions to them. And for anyone who is not wearing it, so that they can learn the arguments on this score. [no end quotation marks] (Commotion in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: Never mind, continue.

S.V. Belozertsev: The fact is that at the meeting in the Luzhniki, for example, they very much wanted to see representatives of the deputies from the CPSU, and also our respected deputies from the Central Asian republics, for whom all voted as one. The voters want to know their position. What else did I want to say here? We have discerned a certain connection between what is being said from this dais. I do not want to exaggerate any contradictions between those who were elected for territorial or national-territorial okrugs and those elected from the public organizations. Eulogies and praise are due the comrades from the public organizations. I do not hold up the academicians as an example here. They, of course, are not included in this category, as are certain other deputies.

In this connection, giving due consideration to the statements of a number of people from the public organizations, in working out the status of the deputy and the recall procedure, provision should be made for the possibility of the people recalling these delegates and for obliging them to deal with the affairs of the people rather than merely defending the interests of their own public organizations. Otherwise they should have a different status. It is essential for them so that during the transition and the elections for the local soviets (I think that an absolute majority of voters will support me here), we abandon one-third and abandon the holding of several posts, because locally in some regions restructuring may come to an end if several posts are held.

Thank you for your attention.

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Barashkov has the floor. The following speaker will be Comrade Samarin.

Yu.A. Barashkov, faculty docent at the Arkhangelsk Timber Institute, Arkhangelsk city (Arkhangelsk Territorial Electoral Okrug, Arkhangelsk Oblast): Respected chairman, respected deputies. Since our last session there have been telephone calls and telegrams without end from Arkhangelsk city, which I represent. The inhabitants of Arkhangelsk are not satisfied in general with our work and they are saying so in their telephone calls and telegrams. Permit be briefly to read one to you: "Comrade people's deputies. I am one of those who you are representing at the congress. We have sent you to the congress to determine the country's fate. The first thing, therefore, is not to fear discussion; do not allow yourself to be pushed in the back or rush to reach decisions. Weigh things, doubt them, come to the truth through dispute. In this way you will achieve a grad advance toward the common goal. This is your work, too crucial to hurry—to be all the time pushing. Be patient and tolerant but do not permit yourselves to be pushed about by appeals of the kind made by one of the deputies (the name is mentioned but I shall not quote it): "There is more than enough idle talk, get to work!" There is a secret appeal: "Listen to the older ones"; an attempt to push your work back onto the old rails. We have already been that way. Second, approach the elections to the

highest organs of power with a greater sense of responsibility than you did during the forming of the Supreme Soviet. Do not fear to waste time discussing every candidate. We have enough unprofessional stewards and incompetent politicians at all levels. The professional political unsuitability of the government is exactly what you should not allow this time. Third. Do not allow phrases like "we must feed the country," that were heard here on the third day of the congress, to confuse or bewilder you. All of us who support restructuring understand that without the creation of new, progressive political structures in the country, economic renewal will also be impossible. And now everyday practice prompts this. What we need is not simply a piece of bread and sausage bought with tokens, but a full-blooded democratic burgeoning of Soviet society. And it is your duty to lay the foundations of our rule-of-law state. Precisely at this congress. Fourth. I would like to remind you that at the first people's congress we elected you under the slogan "All power to the soviets." But up to now this has not sounded out at the congress. Establishing soviet power in the country was the task set by Lenin for the Bolsheviks in 1917.

And this last position comes directly from letter after letter. Here is a fragment from another letter: "The bureaucratic apparatus will win again; the transfer of real power to the soviets is in doubt." And so forth.

After the congress each of us will have to render an accounting. It is very important that each of us who has been delegated should know our possibilities. I am asked continuously: What did you vote for? I support the Muscovites and I support the statements by Popov and Afanasyev. I voted in favor of there being debate first and then a vote, and so forth. I shall not be ashamed to look my voters in the eye. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Samarin has the floor. The following speaker will be Comrade Obolenskiy.

V.I. Samarin, staff correspondent for the newspaper ORLOVSKAYA PRAVDA, Orel city (Orel Territorial Electoral Okrug, Orel Oblast): Respected colleagues. Respected citizen president. (Commotion in the hall). Well, what is so special here? Since we have been discussing procedural matters, I would like to deal with this. More than once I have heard the following question at this congress: "When shall we get down to business? When shall we start to discuss the very important issues in the life of society, the economic and social reforms, and so forth?" But just consider for a moment: Without the creation of a serious, proper, mobile governmental machinery, how is it possible to create those reforms and implement them? I think that it is impossible. Therefore, on behalf of our delegation from Orel, I welcome first the election of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the post of president (for some reason this has not pleased everyone, but I think it was a most proper appointment), and to the post of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Here on the organizational plane we have made a very sure and correct step. And we made it virtually unanimously.

It is another matter with the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, since we do not know each other very well, or each other's positions, and, of course, we have approached the formation of this very important organ to some extent formally. And it is understandable that things have not turned out as they might have done.

With regard to the other organs: Today we have elected the first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I personally also voted for Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, even though I think that there could have been alternative nominations in the congress. Our present Constitution contains two articles, numbers 108 and 121. Article 108 states that it is the exclusive prerogative of the Congress of People's Deputies "to elect the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

And then it suddenly goes on to say "confirmation of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and confirmation of the chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR Procurator General, and the USSR Chief State Arbiter." And again "the election of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee."

If, of course, you just take a quick glance there is nothing strange in this. But the fact is that the appointments to all these high positions will be done by the USSR Supreme Soviet, and as you know, one-fifth of the composition of the Supreme Soviet will be changed each year. And so what we have is the following interesting story: We shall elect the highest officials for 5 years, and the chairman of the Constitutional Oversight Committee for 10 years, but after two or three years the Supreme Soviet will be quite different in composition, and will perhaps have quite different opinions on these top state dignitaries.

What will follow from this? I believe that the appointment or election (we are already saying this) of all top state officials—what I have in mind is the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, the chairman of the People's Control Committee, the USSR Procurator General, and the Chief State Arbiter—all these things should be the prerogative of the Congress of People's Deputies, which is elected for 5 years and which for 5 years will carefully monitor the work of those state officials. I think that this is essential.

There has been much talk here about the Muscovites. In principle I agree with the position of many of Moscow's deputies. Of course, emotion did sometimes gain the upper hand in the statements of Gavriil Popov and particularly Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev. In their place I would never appeal for withdrawal from the Moscow group or the Moscow delegation, but would call for the consolidation of all democratic forces, for their assembly. I tell you candidly that we do not have a

Moscow trend, we have a democratic trend, a trend that we shall call well-considered. So that we have more people's deputies in the democratic camp—and I appeal to all of you for this. Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Samarin, you will, notwithstanding, withdraw the "mister." We all heard....

V.I. Samarin: I said "Citizen President...."

From the hall: Citizen....

M.S. Gorbachev: I beg your pardon.

V.I. Samarin: I was surprised that everyone reacted so. "Citizen President" of course, Mikhail Sergeyevich....

M.S. Gorbachev: I call you comrade, you call me mister. Fine. We are agreed. Deputy Obolenskiy has the floor. The following speaker will be Comrade Yudin.

A.M. Obolenskiy, design engineer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Polar Geophysics Institute at the Kolskiy Such Center, Apatity city (Leningrad Rural National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, RSFSR): Respected deputies. Before getting to the nub of the matter I would like to appeal to those who have already spoken from this dais. Please, check that your statement is correct in the stenographic record. In my statement one paragraph was entirely missing, the one in which I made critical remarks about our chairman. Moreover, in the stenographic account published in IZVESTIYA a remark from the hall that I did not make was attributed to me. So check in any event while everything is still fresh in your head. And now I shall discuss how, what, and why.

At our forum we are hearing frequent references to the Constitution, and people are saying that we have the right to stand above the powers not peculiar to the congress and to appropriate them for ourselves. Let me remind you of Article 108, second paragraph: "The Congress of People's Deputies is empowered to make its own examination and resolve any matter relating to the authority of the USSR." You understand: any!

Now to procedure. I recall that in 1917 one of the first decrees of the 2nd Congress of Soviets was the Decree on Power. I believe that at our congress, too, this is also a key issue. "All Power to the Soviets." This slogan is heard quite often everywhere in the country. And willy-nilly this issue has been raised here with us. The first to propose adoption of the decree was Academician Sakharov. It was not adopted. Then the issue of power came up when we were discussing the question of whether or not the post of general secretary could be combined with the post of Supreme Soviet chairman. We did not resolve the matter in principle at that time, although it was resolved indirectly by electing Mikhail Sergeyevich without any kind of reservations to the post of Supreme Soviet chairman. This means that we voted for it. But in my opinion, those who think that Mikhail Sergeyevich will direct the party in the Politburo are mistaken. The Politburo is a collective organ, and why not admit that it will be under the control of the party apparatus? This is understood, is it not? Accordingly, since we have already avoided these two factors, I think that this question should again be raised for the congress. Incidentally, I received yesterday a collective letter signed by 170 people on this subject, from the city of Apatity, containing a proposal to raise the question of abolishing or fundamentally changing Article 6 of the Constitution, since the leading and guiding role of the CPSU affirmed in it will sound like an additional argument in favor of its subordination to Politburo decisions. The Constitution must be observed.... (Applause).

And now something that they are telling us we have not dealt with. So many businesslike proposals have been made from this dais that their number exceeds several, nay ten earlier sessions of the Supreme Soviet (I am ready to answer for that). But this is what seems strange to me. Our deputies, all of us, simply do not know how, have not become accustomed to using our own right of legislative initiative. For in fact a proposal from a deputy is a proposal to make a legislative decision on a specific matter. But we do not know how to stand our ground here. We offer our ideas obediently to the presidium and then we have the formula "we shall consider it, take it under advisement, work on it, and the Supreme Soviet will decide at the next congress...." But you are not allowing for the fact that there may not be another congress, that it may be dissolved, as at one time the inaugural meeting was, and will our people's power end with that? (Applause).

I believe that in no case should our congress end until fundamental decisions have been made.

Further, it is necessary to set up a commission on legislative proposals. If I am so entrusted I am ready to be part of it. And to introduce a general rule: for example, after a day, the clearly formulated proposals submitted today to the commission should be put to the vote. This will not be a law, it will be a decision or decree of the congress on key issues. A law could come later, on their basis, drawn up by the Supreme Soviet. It will be a guideline.

Furthermore. We are in a great hurry. We are resolving things morning and evening. But let us stop for a while and get to know each other, and think about things. I propose that our meetings be split. In the morning, while heads are still clear, a general meeting. After lunch meetings, say, of sections, or groups, as you like. So that in their own interests deputies would become acquainted without, in general, wasting time. Perhaps certain key directions could be established for the commissions, already worked on by experts and interested people. And after lunch it would be possible to hold parallel meetings of the working commissions.

And finally, I believe that the commission on the Gdlyan and Ivanov cases should be set up urgently so that they can set to work. Our congress does not have the right to break up until a principled decision has been reached on this matter. They say that this is unrealistic.... But consider: We must elect a procurator general. I think it is understood who will be proposed. Sukharev, obviously. And the way in which this matter will be resolved will depend on whether or not he is the procurator. This is my opinion. Although it is difficult, I understand.

M.S. Gorbachev: Have you finished?

A.M. Obolenskiy: I am just finishing; give me a second.

M.S. Gorbachev: You can have a minute.

A.M. Obolenskiy: I would like only to propose that this commission then be transformed into a commission on compliance with socialist legality. Tomorrow I shall submit an official request to Comrade Sukharev. A voter has appealed to me with reference to two young people who have been held for 8 months on suspicion of attempted rape. It appears from the copies they have been given that socialist legality has been violated. There is another case for you. (Commotion in the hall). And finally.

M.S. Gorbachev: No, you have already gone over your time, comrade.

A.M. Obolenskiy: I was only about to state the names.

M.S. Gorbachev: No, you are a minute-and-a-half over time. It is not necessary.

A.M. Obolenskiy: Comrades. (Commotion in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: One minute. OK. Go ahead.

A.M. Obolenskiy: I shall just name the names. There were indignant exclamations from the Leningrad delegate when Ivanov spoke. My comrades have asked me, and taking advantage of this I shall just the same name those who are in solidarity with what he said in support of Afanasyev. Ivanov, Shchelkanov, Levashev, Obolenskiy, Kolotov, Petrov, Granin, Zhuk, Sychov. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine.

A.M. Obolenskiy: I apologize publicly to Comrade Granin; it seems that I was in error.

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Yudin has the floor. Comrade Popov will be next.

A.M. Obolenskiy: Forgive me, Comrade Petrov is also dissociating himself from this. One moment. The fact is that I misstated it. In this text that I was asked to make public, it stated that these comrades support Afanasyev's statement.

M.S. Gorbachev: So, Comrade Yudin, please.

V.D. Yudin, chief of the Central Geochemical Party in the Central Geophysics Expedition of the Northeast Production Geological Association, Khasyn city, Khasynskiy Rayon (Magadan Territorial Electoral Okrug, Magadan Oblast): We are now discussing procedural matters. Permit me to recall those who are familiar with the information and report to those who are not. According to the results of sociological studies, 57 percent of the deputies here present consider one essential condition for good work to be an obligatory consideration of the opinions of all USSR people's deputies during the adoption of legislative decisions; 54 percent are dissatisfied with procedural decisions; and 56 percent think that maintaining law and order in the country is very important. But law and order in the country begins with our congress, comrades. And I draw your attention to the fact that today we have voted for the second time to cancel the preliminary list for statements to be made after the report. What kind of order is this? We quite calmly reverse questions resolved in the Constitution, while in other cases we support the Constitution even where it is not specifically indicated. I have in mind the first day session when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev chaired a half-day meeting without having the authority under the Constitution to do so, while we confirmed that right for him after the event. I think that we should be dealing with these matters in a more principled manner. Before moving on to my statement proper, I must not forget to ask all deputies to set forth factual material very clearly. We have just seen a good example of this with Comrade Obolenskiy, and before him, with Deputy Belozertsev, if I am not mistaken, who showed us a red study book. Comrades, I was at the meeting. The red study book has a different formulation. I do not remember exactly what, but it is different. I ask all who attend this meeting to provide an accurate formulation so that people are not led into error.

Further, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the entire session of our representative body is taking place under the sign of democracy. But, comrades, democracy has its own preferences. One is that the majority really does carry through its decisions. Notwithstanding, I believe that one inseparable preference of a democratic meeting is the right of the minority to speak and defend its own opinion.

You are aware that I was defeated for inflexible and unconditionally different thinking—what we today call having a pluralist opinion— being rejected in the voting for the Supreme Soviet and in the list of the RSFSR delegation for the Council of Nationalities. All the deputies who expressed quite sharp but essentially correct

opinions received a majority of minuses, and have no opportunity to defend their viewpoint in the Supreme Soviet.

I therefore think that the question of a roll-call vote is of fundamental importance for us today, from the standpoint of enhancing the sense of responsibility of a deputy to his voters. The version for which we voted, proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, essentially did not make sense. What is the sense of a majority insisting on a roll-call vote when the decision has already been reached and the majority regarded it as law? As a method for a roll-call vote, before the hall is equipped with a computer, I see the following scenario. Each deputy would be given some kind of roll-call check book. We know the number of the session, and the number of the issue being resolved. The deputy writes in his viewpoint. Those in a minority are passed to the secretariat.

I believe that we must adhere more rigidly to the procedure on deputies' requests and deputies' notes. On the day of the elections to the Supreme Soviet I submitted a list with a proposal that deputies be shown film of the events in Tbilisi, because those events are evoking extensive interest in the country, and each of us must complete and carry out explanatory work on the basis of the facts. I received neither an answer to that note nor any proposal about when the film might be shown. Even though, you will recall, on that day we spent 4 hours looking for something to do, and one hour would have been ample to look at this important document quite calmly.

I remind you that deputy (I beg your pardon if I have the name wrong) Alksins made a very serious request to the Credential Commission about the correctness of forming okrugs in one of the Baltic republics. Today it has now been 3 days since the deputy submitted his request, and I see no possibility of receiving an answer to that request from the Credentials Commission.

And finally, one very important matter. We spent an entire day discussing possible opposition at this congress. Comrades, why is there not today a formally constituted deputy group studying the administrative principle that we are today criticizing in the press, and which does not meet the urgent demands of today's congress and the demands of most deputies? I think that the formation of deputy groups is mandatory and necessary for us. I support the proposal to give the Moscow group the opportunity to present a co-report. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Popov, deputy from Moscow, has the floor. Time for the evening session is running out, and I shall not announce the following speaker. We shall talk about it later....

G.Kh. Popov, chief editor of the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI, Moscow city (from the USSR Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies): Comrades, on Friday we evidently agreed that work would be conducted normally and in a spirit of cooperation. And I would like to propose to you one version that it seems to me could now become a basis for resolving one serious issue.

As you know, in the election of deputies in the RSFSR there were 11 seats, as laid down by the Constitution. Twelve candidates were nominated for those 11 seats. The last on the list was Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, even though he collected 50 percent of the votes—that is, could have passed.

On the same day, as you also know, two deputies from our favorite Leningrad, comrades Sobchak and Denisov, had already put forward the idea of resigning from the Supreme Soviet in order to resolve the question of Nagorno-Karabakh. In my opinion a more correct decision could have been made on the Karabakh problem. And the question has now arisen of resolving the problem of representation in the Soviet of Nationalities for the more than 6 million voters of Moscow. I would also like to say that this kind of example, demonstrated here by the Leningraders, is also being demonstrated by Deputy Aleksey Ivanovich Kazannik, representative from our glorious Siberia, whom I now ask to speak—the deputy from Omsk National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, a docent at Omsk State University. He has been entered on the list of 11 winning deputies, and he asks for your considering the question of his withdrawing his nomination for the Soviet of Nationalities, so that the next majority of votes for the Council of Nationalities might include Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Thank you. (Applause). I ask you to hear Deputy Aleksey Ivanovich Kazannik.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Kazannik, do you wish to speak? Do you confirm this? (Applause).

A.I. Kazannik, docent at Omsk State University (Omsk National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, RSFSR): Respected comrade deputies. The fact is that I suggested my own nomination as an alternative. And three times I spoke at the meeting of representatives, asking that my name be included in the composition of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I say in fact that I very much want to work there. The fact is, I am a lawyer, and had intended to work professionally in the USSR Supreme Soviet. I say that I am interested in working during precisely the first year because it will be concerning itself with about 50 very important laws, that will determine the fate of our country perhaps even through the year 2000. But when the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet took place and I saw that because of our political shortsightedness we had "axed" outstanding scholars, and that because of our improvidence we had not allowed the politicians in, I made what was in my opinion the only correct decision: namely that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin should work in the USSR Supreme Soviet, or more accurately, in the Soviet of Nationalities. (Applause).

If I were the first secretary of a party obkom I might not have reached that decision, but would have boldly

returned to my native land and have been guarded in my obkom by a border of militiamen—and not one single voter would have come near me. But if I go back like this I will be ashamed to look them in the eyes. I therefore request that you include Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin in the composition of the Soviet of Nationalities, without a vote, on condition that he assume my nomination, and only on this condition. I fear, comrades, that if a second vote is taken Boris Nikolayevich will again be "blocked," and this is quite impermissible. This is how I look at this problem. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, I am no great lawyer, and it is therefore necessary that we consult as to whether or not we can do this. I am certain that we can issue a statement on the constitution of the powers of a deputy. But I am not sure that we can simply include an empty seat in the Soviet of Nationalities from Russia when we take into account the results of a previous vote. (Commotion in the hall). Wait, it is essential that by doing this we do not commit some stupidity. I therefore ask that either we provide an opportunity tomorrow for study of this problem, and bring it up for discussion, or if anyone has a clear idea on this, let let him give us his ideas.

Comrade Sobchak? Please.

From the hall: Do you support it...?

M.S. Gorbachev: In principle I support this proposal....

A.A. Sobchak, department chief in the faculty of law at the Leningrad State University (Vasileoostrovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Leningrad city): I believe that Comrade Kazannik has committed a serious legal error here. The error is that, whereas any elected deputy may withdraw his nomination and refuse a nomination to the Supreme Soviet, there is no doubt that a candidate may not impose conditions on that refusal. This is, so to speak, true both in our legislation and in world legal practice. Therefore we may now discuss Comrade Kazannik's refusal only if he withdraws his condition that he will decline the nomination only if Comrade Yeltsin take his place as, for example, a deputy who is a member of the Council of Nationalities. That is the first issue.

The second issue is that of who should take over the seat vacated in the Council of Nationalities as a result of Comrade Kazannik's withdrawal. This issue is not directly addressed in our legislation, because all previous practice in elections to the Supreme Soviet has simply excluded such a situation.

World legal practice varies in different countries. Here, only two variants are possible. If the withdrawal takes place, then the candidate who polled the next largest number of votes under the procedure that has already taken place automatically becomes a member of the appropriate chamber of the Supreme Soviet. (Applause). This is the first variant. And the second is that there will be a vote for all those wishing to be nominated for the post—say, who have already been nominated and who have already voted—and the question of representation will be resolved according to the result of that new vote.

In my opinion the former procedure is more correct. And if we are satisfied that Comrade Kazannik is withdrawing unconditionally, then the next deputy should be the one who polled the largest number of votes, in this case without an alternative. But in order for this solution to take effect, a congress vote will be needed because, I repeat, no provision is made in our legislation for either procedure. We must therefore first decide which variant we will choose.

M.S. Gorbachev: Does any other lawyer wish to speak? Comrade Burlatskiy.

F.M. Burlatskiy, political observer for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, Moscow city (from the Soviet Peace Foundation jointly with the 8 Soviet committees for peace, solidarity and international cooperation): Comrades, I believe that this issue is not only a legal one, but also political. What we need to do here is not look for some precedent or form, but move to the essence of the matter. I express only my own personal opinion; I disagree with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin on many issues and and ready to enter into dispute with him, but, giving due consideration to the fact that Moscow has by an overwhelming majority voted for that candidate, it is essential to deal reasonably with this. I therefore propose, comrades, that since there is a person who has announced his withdrawal, that seat should automatically be assumed by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Thank you. (Applause).

A.P. Yanenko, rector of the Novosibirsk Construction Engineering Institute (Oktyabrskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Novosibirsk Oblast): I would like to remind you, dear colleagues, that when the first session of our congress opened, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev took the chair. According to the Constitution, it should have been chaired by the chairman of the Central Electoral Commission. But the congress decided to confirm Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as congress chairman. I therefore suggest that the congress has a real right to decide that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin be in the composition of the USSR Supreme Soviet, after a proposal to that effect has been adopted. (Applause).

B.V. Miroshin, chairman of Sovetskiy Rayispolkom, Orsk city (Orsk Territorial Electoral Okrug, RSFSR): Respected comrades, I work as a rayispolkom chairman and am by education a lawyer. I have had an opportunity to see the reaction of the Muscovites in the election campaign, I know the results of the voting in Moscow for Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, and I personally voted for him in the voting for the Soviet of Nationalities. I am aware of the mood of the people of Orenburg, particularly my own fellow townspeople, my voters, who favor

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Last Saturday on Revolution Square I met a large number of Muscovites and guests of the city, and was there from 2200 in the evening until 0130 the next morning answering questions, including questions about Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. The viewpoint has already been expressed, comrades, and I support it, that we make the only reasonable and correct decision—to give the vacant seat to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Krayko, please. (Commotion in the hall). Comrades, we need consultation.

A.N. Krayko, section chief in the P.I. Baranov Central Institute of Aviation Engine Building, Moscow city (Baumanskiy Territory Electoral Okrug, Moscow city): Comrades, the question is in the main clear, since everyone is expressing himself in one mind, and it will be correct if we so decide about Comrade Yeltsin. But I would like simply to draw your attention to one factor. The fact is that everyone is asking the following question: As the list of candidates contained 12 people rather than 11, how did the alternative appear? Everyone can see the machinations of the apparatus in this. I would like to say that this then became clear: The fact that the list contained 12 names was on the initiative of Boris Nikolayevich. It testifies exactly to his honesty and probity, and to the fact that he serves the purpose for which we have elected him. The fact is that Boris Nikolayevich insisted that there be an alternative in the elections for other posts, and naturally he could not make an exception for himself. So there it is; I have explained it for him and for Comrade Vorotnikov, and it really is so—Yeltsin insisted that the list contain 12 names. It is another matter that we could not immediately imagine that someone would withdraw. I therefore support the proposal, and I have offered this explanation so that the whole country may know about it. I think the fact that Boris Nikolayevich acted in this way is an additional argument in favor of his being in the Soviet of Nationalities.

M.S. Gorbachev: So, comrades, there has been an exchange of opinions. We have been discussing procedural matters for 2 hours and our time has run out. We are limited to these statements. Permit me to avail myself of the counsel from the comrades who have spoken here and sum up the debate, even though it is difficult to always find a line of conduct in this heated discussion. I think—and I would like to assure you that I am sticking to the main issue—that the atmosphere at our congress has remained democratic, that there has been a great diversity and pluralism of opinions on all matters discussed, and that it is from this that we here in the presidium will proceed. But this is not so simple given the enormous number of initiatives from deputies and given that, in addition to the agenda, to which it would seem we should strictly adhere, many issues have been raised to which we have had to respond. I think that we are gaining experience but are not changing the main issues, and although we do adhere to the agenda, we are at the same time resolving questions that arise so as to preserve the democratic atmosphere. That is first.

Now, comrades, permit me to propose the following to you. Perhaps we should act thus. Very many important issues have been raised here. Let us assign the presidium and the secretariat the task of extracting from all the statements the proposals of a substantive nature. There are many of them. If I were to start listing only those that I have noted from comrades' statements, we would be dragged into another long discussion. I think that we must categorize the most substantive proposals and let the presidium and secretariat consider what should be done about particular proposals. In one form or another the categorized proposals will be passed to the deputies and then a determination will be made of how we should proceed with particular matters. Certainly we have now set the kind of consideration that no other approach is possible, otherwise there will be a muddle and the entire discussion will have to be repeated. If you have no objections, then we shall assign the congress presidium and secretariat the task of generalizing the comments that have been made by deputies and of submitting these proposals to each deputy, while at the same time considering how to implement them. Who is in favor of this proposal, if there are no others, comrades? This is what I think: this must all be generalized tomorrow, and by the end of the day generalized proposals circulated, and the presidium will determine in, say, 2 days, what kind of commission is needed to implement these and other assignments provided for in the documents.

From the hall: Mikhail Sergeyevich, the question of Yeltsin....

M.S. Gorbachev: We are resolving Yeltsin now.

From the hall: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Microphone No 1 is next to you. Switch it on.

From the hall: In my opinion we must add one other proposal to yours. Many substantive proposals have not been voiced since there has been no time under the Rules. But there may be very specific and fine proposals.

M.S. Gorbachev: I agree. So we must include the following point: Comrades who consider it necessary to put forward specific proposals may submit them to the congress secretariat.

From the hall: Then how can each deputy exercise his right of legislative initiative? How shall we act in this case? Deputies have specific proposals....

M.S. Gorbachev: You know that we here in the presidium have already discussed this issue and have concluded that perhaps during the course of the congress work we must have a special commission of deputies.

This is not a standing institution but a working commission. We can consider and introduce proposals in it.

From the hall: I have received many telegrams on various subjects. In particular, one telegram states that if we do not have direct secret balloting then we shall look like an okrug meeting.... And Yeltsin would have been elected to the Supreme Soviet right from the start.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, I am putting to the vote the proposal that was put forward, with one very important addition: Those comrades who have been unable to speak but who have proposals may pass them to the congress secretariat. I ask those in favor of this resolution to raise their hands. Thank you. Against? No. Abstentions? The resolution is carried.

Let us turn to the question that Comrade Popov raised, on the basis of which we held our consultation....

From the hall: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: The question is resolved. Resolved by the congress.

From the hall: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: The next problem that has been raised. When it was raised it was done so by Comrade Popov, and I asked the lawyers to give their opinions about the possibilities available to us here, and about what kind of legal basis we have here for adopting any particular decision. I think that in principle we are favorably inclined resolving the matter. But let us do it in parts. First. The withdrawal of Deputy Kazannik—we can accept this.

From the hall: Mikhail Sergeyevich, it seems to me.... (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: So, everything is clear. Comrade Kazannik. You wanted to say something? Switch on the second microphone. It is necessary that you withdraw all conditions.

A.I. Kazannik: Comrades, I cannot withdraw the conditions. And do you know why? I fear that if I now relinquish my powers Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will say: "Who, comrades, is in favor of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin being on the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities?" To judge from how we elected the Supreme Soviet, I fear that a majority in this hall will vote against Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. I would therefore like to put forward a proposal. If I withdraw my nomination I reason further that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin will automatically become a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, since he has obtained an absolute majority of the votes. I do not see why it depends here on the fact that I first withdraw without any conditions, and that we then put it to the vote and elect him. I fear that the opposite may happen....

M.S. Gorbachev: Very well.

From the hall: Comrades, there is no problem here. The sequence must be changed. First we vote on whether or not we accept the procedural proposal that in the event that one of those elected withdraws, then his place will be taken by the person with the next largest number of votes. (Applause).

And the withdrawal is the second question. Then it is up to the comrade as to whether or not he will withdraw his nomination, according to the result of the first vote. (Applause).

From the hall: Wonderful, I fully agree.

M.S. Gorbachev: Let us consider what happens if we reverse this pyramid. Yes, Comrade (name inaudible). I fear that the main thing would be that in our haste we would get it wrong and not do the proper thing.

Deputy (not introduced): Respected comrades. The existing status of the people's deputies provides for the following procedure for the early relinquishing of the powers of deputy. The powers of a deputy may be withdrawn early at the decision of the Soviet. We have adopted no changes, in connection with the congress, on the personal statement of a deputy with respect to him relinquishing his powers of deputy because of circumstances that prevent their exercise. Consequently.... (Commotion in the hall).

Thank you very much for the prompting; I would like to return to the following. A procedure does exist within the framework of the status. Consequently, in order for us now to reach a decision, we can decide either by chance, on impulse—and then, consequently, we can do anything we like here—or we should now provide an opportunity for preparing tomorrow a procedural amendment, which I have already mentioned here, on the possibility of not simply a deputy but a member of the Supreme Soviet withdrawing, and then whoever is next in line should take that seat. There you have it. (Commotion in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: If anyone is confusing us, comrades, well, they are lawyers.

L.A. Kuznetsov, senior teacher in the botany department at the Leningrad A.I. Gertsen State Pedagogical Institute, Leningrad city (from the societies and associations of the USSR Academy of Sciences): I propose that this problem, which everyone obviously wants to resolve, be resolved in the following manner. We do have a precedent, so let us act in accordance with the precedent with respect to the Soviet of the Union. We rescinded our decision on the confirmation there with respect to the

Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Republic. Here, in the same way, we can rescind our decision with respect to the RSFSR, after which Deputy Kazannik can then withdraw his nomination and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin will automatically take his seat. I believe that we can act in this way from precedent.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, what if, despite all out desires to find a positive solution to this question, you allow the presidium together with the lawyers to work on this question, and have the matter introduced tomorrow so that it can be resolved?

Then let us go into recess. Fine, then I shall take the risk that of availing myself of the fact that there is no organ higher than the congress. I am a convinced advocate of our not tampering with the present Constitution; everything should be decided very carefully, without haste. But in this case we shall not affect the Constitution.

From the hall: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: It is a matter of, so to speak, an election law, a matter of elections and of unregulated matters. We must, perhaps, ourselves create precedent here. If, I think, it had been a matter of Comrade Yeltsin slipping by without obtaining half or more of the votes, then the question would no longer arise; it would simply be voted on and we would not have been able to use the vacancy that would be opened up because of the withdrawal of Deputy Kazannik. But since we do have a statement to that effect and an opportunity is opening up for us, then we will be able to resort to the following procedure: Because Comrade Yeltsin obtained more than half of the votes, then he should occupy the seat that becomes vacant. And then, naturally, there will be no need for another vote. So, let us start with the proposal to adopt the proposal of, I think, Comrade Palm, in his formulation. I have repeated its sense.

Those in favor of the proposal raise their hands. Thank you. Against? Any abstentions? Well, comrades, just a few. So, the matter is resolved.

Then we must satisfy the request of member of the Supreme Soviet Deputy Kazannik on relinquishing his powers, and welcome his initiative. (Applause).

Let me put this question to the vote. All those in favor of satisfying the request of Deputy Kazannik that he relinquish his duties as a member of the Soviet of Nationalities, please raise their hands. Thank you. Against? There are several. Abstentions? The matter is resolved. (Applause).

So, taking into account the report of the chairman of the counting commission on all candidates, and giving due consideration to these present decisions, we can now adopt a resolution confirming the minutes of the counting commission, adding the changes stemming from these decisions. (Applause).

From the hall: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: There is no need to vote on the RSFSR, that is until we leave the matter and consider it regulated.

We still have one matter on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Republic. But we have already run over 30 minutes. I think that we can return to that question. But let comrades be ready to make their proposals. One more thing: as there was tension here after the statement by one of the representatives of the deputy group from Azerbaijan, and representatives of the deputy group from Armenia also wanted to speak, I would like to say the following. Again tension has arisen among us and again, so to speak, mutual claims are being made. I therefore once again appeal to the group of deputies from Armenia and the group of deputies from Azerbaijan to maintain friendly relations and to look for ways of rapprochement. And finally, the discussion must not be turned upside down. The comrades from Armenia have agreed to my request, and also with what I will say. I would like once again to remark, comrades, that at the congress we must approach everything with a great sense of responsibility, and especially this subject, since it has been brought up.

I think that we can end our meeting today. The meeting is closed. If anyone has unresolved questions he should come here. Until tomorrow at 1000 hours.